

I'm not a bot



In AE, we often order fried eggs (oeufs plat) "over easy," i.e., once the eggs are nearly cooked, they are turned upside down briefly in the pan which seals les jaunes and keeps them from running, but still leaves them soft. Any suggestions for the equivalent in French? Thanks. fried eggs "over easy" = ufs tourns ufs sur le plat ou Miroir ou Sunny side up (en anglais) : le jaune, apparent, reste liquide.ufs tourns ou Over easy (en anglais) : le jaune est liquide mais non apparent car l'uf a t retourné mi-cuisson.(source : Wikipdia) Merci, G'berg. Est-ce vrai galement en France qu'au Canada? Parce que l'info Wiki que tu a cit ne comporte pas tout fait mes experiences. Ici Paris je ne vois jamais "oeufs sur le plat" mais "oeufs plat" et aux tats-Unis on n'entend que rarement ces jours-ci "sunnyside up" mais "fried eggs." Bien sr, je suis genoux devant les Wiki, mais je me demande combien les idiotismes Wiki sont (ou soient) dpasss. Moi, je n'en sais rien. Qu'en penses-tu? Merci. Hello, I have lived for 15 years in France but am a native British English speaker, and now have lived 15 years in the USA. "Sunnyside up" vs "Over easy" are quintessentially American concepts. French people do not usually eat eggs for breakfast but something sweet or simply a croissant dunked in a caf au lait, a chocolat chaud or taken with butter and jam. When eggs are served fried, it is usually understood that "oeufs sur le plat" means pan-fried eggs but there is no sub-term to distinguish whether or not the eggs have been flipped. Obviously Gutenberg would disagree with you about this. So do I. At least we agree that "oeufs tourns" does the trick, though I may be a little doubtful about the currency other terms. And FYI I have a number of French friends and acquaintances who will make an omelette for breakfast-only at home when no one is looking. Il n'y a pas une tradition des oeufs au plat ici, pour le petit djeuner. A la coque oui, aussi toutes ces precisions risquent de contrarier bien des garons de caf.Budd, es-tu certain d'avoir entendu oeufs plat Paris?Quant aux oeufs miroir, ils sont passs quelques instants au four. Ginette Mathiot. La cuisine pour tous. Je penche pour des ufs au plat... et non plat. Mais ce n'est pas commun de retourner les ufs frits en France. Last edited: Aug 10, 2009 Gutenberg is a Quebecker. My post referred only to the culture in France. I understand that Quebec, a North American region, shares many of the same habits as other North Americans. Ask for an "oeuf tourn" in France and you'll probably get a puzzled look and have to explain what you want. Sorry to contradict you, but I am French, born in France. Hello, I knew that Gutenberg wasn't born and raised in Quebec, but I was. So this will confirm that we indeed call the "over easy eggs" = ufs tourns. Unless you specify that you want them served in another fashion, e.g. pochés (poached) / brouillés (scrambled) / au miroir (sunny side up) / la coque (soft boiled), etc. they'll serve you des ufs tourns. As for : plat / au plat / sur le plat... I personally only heard the latter, although au miroir seems more common in Quebec. As found in an old (1835) version of Dictionnaire de l'Acadmie franaise OEufs au miroir, OEufs qu'on fait cuire sur un plat enduit de beurre, sans les brouiller, et qu'on nomme aussi OEufs sur le plat. Last edited: Aug 10, 2009 The variety of "fried eggs" that are turned over (" oeufs tourns ") are known in AE variously as eggs over, eggs over easy or eggs over light (all mean the same). There are also eggs over medium or eggs over hard--meaning the yolks are cooked until semi- or fully hard. " Tourns " comment au Qubec? mous-moyens-durs? Salut Bill, Tourns, tout court, pour over easy. Je crois bien qu'on dirait tourns, jaune dur ou jaune (bien) cuit... pour over hard Pour medium, je ne suis pas certaine. Il me semble que les gens les aiment "easy" ou alors bien cuits - rien qui bouge . Jaune pas trop mou, peut-tre. Si je commande des ufs pochés, alors l je prcise jaune mou, parce que souvent, les restaurateurs les font trop cuire mon got. Budd, es-tu certain d'avoir entendu oeufs plat Paris? Doinel, yes I am, though I have read it on menus and blackboards more often than I have heard it. What made me raise the question was a walk I took yesterday (Sunday) that took me past several cafs obviously catering to Americans (each meal was translated into English--and evidently "bacon" has become a French word). All of them offered "oeufs plat ou brouillés" and that got me wondering about "over easy." I grant that les garons de caf have not yet supplanted the Acadmie franaise as the source of le bon usage--and maybe Ren Liembre had it right after all. I was simply reporting what I saw on a random walk. Ok, from what I have gathered from different recipe sites in French, there is no distinction between European French and Quebecois French in regards to eggs. Oeufs au plat - are fried eggs cooked in such a manner that the edges are crisp but the yoke remains relatively fluid. They are not turned over but the white is cooked all the way through. Oeufs la pole - These eggs are sunny side up. Oeufs miroir - These are also sunny side up but they are cooked with a lid so you have a very thin layer of congealment on the top. Oeufs brouillés - scrambled eggs, they have no variations like in the US of scrambled hard or soft. Oeufs pochés - poached eggs Oeufs tourns - are basically eggs that are turned over. There is no designation on how they are cooked whether it is over-easy, over-medium, or over-well. If you have to be specific, I would suggest you order them tourns cuit la lgre, mi-cuit, or bien cuit. Salut, Budd, es-tu certain d'avoir entendu oeufs plat Paris? [...] I grant that les garons de caf have not yet supplanted the Acadmie franaise as the source of le bon usage [...] Mme si certains garons de caf peuvent ne pas avoir invent la poudre, je n'en connais pas un qui craitait a sauf... s'il n'tait pas franais ! Un saisonnier tranger, peut-tre ? ufs au plat ou ufs sur le plat. Ah, Karine, you suspect the foreign devils, a great Satan, infiltrating cafs and corrupting French egg cuisine. Why not? But I also notice the chalkboards that announce oeufs plat are in the handwriting typical of French menu boards (all of them, I assume, are written in the early hours of the morning by a small squadron retired teachers of penmanship)--and it is the same handwriting I see when I also read oeufs sur [le] plat and even ...au plat. I think the fifth column that you (and I) suspect is French. "uf au plat retourm mi-cuisson" I used to work in a restaurant in Quebec City and people would ask for des ufs tourns or miroir or even more specifically, for those with more extreme preferences, des ufs tourns crevs or miroir baveux.PS: Tourn crev is not the same as brouill. One thing you learn in the restaurant business is that people are very particular about their eggs! Hello everyone, The structure has veen a puzzling thing to me. 1. He is easy to kill the animal.2. He is easy to be killed.For sentence1, it is said to be wrong when it means "People feel that he can kill the animal easily".For sentence2, Is it possible to mean "People feel he is to be killed easily," ?I want to know "Is there any other possible meaning for these two sentences to be correct" ? 3. The box is easy ____ A. to carry B. to be carried.I think both A and B are correct, but I feelit the speaker himself wants to carry the box, he would use A.if the speaker wants some other problem is to carry the box, he would use B.However, they basically mean the same thing and actually, the above difference does not exist. Many thanks "He is easy to kill the animal" is wrong no matter what you want it to mean."He is easy to be killed." "The box is easy to be carried." "The box is easy to be carried." Here "easy" applies to "box". It does not apply to "be carried". To apply "easy" to "carry" you can write any of these: The box is easy to carry.The box is easily carried.It is easy for the box to be carried.It is easy to carry the box. He is easy to be fooled> in this forum is correct The sentence "He is easy to be fooled." is not correct in English. Correct versions are: He is easy to fool.He is easily fooled.What I write here matches the answers given in that thread. One answer says "You are easy to be fooled" is "defective", meaning incorrect. The other answer says it must change from "You are easy to be fooled" to "You are easily fooled". 1. "The box is easy to be carried."Here "easy" applies to "box". It does not apply to "be carried". To apply "easy" to "carry" you can write any of these:2. The box is easy to carry. I still feel it hard to get the hang of the difference between the two easy's in 1 and 2 respectively.In sentence2, which does the "easy" apply to? PS I have deleted my post3# because I mistook the meaning of the quoted post.Many thanks. "Easy to carry" is a standard form (adjective+to infinitive) where the adjective modifies the infinitive: easy to do, hard to do, too big to carry, happy to help. 1. The box is easy to carry. (correct)2. The box is easy to be carried. (wrong) Could it be said that when the subject can act as the object of "to do", then the sentence is correct?1. The box is easy to carry.-->--> to carry the box (OK)2. The box is easy to be carried. -----> to be carried the box. (wrong)I think 3 is correct. He is easy to deal with. ----> to deal with the man. (OK) That makes sense to me. You are better at analyzing things than me. ? Many thanks.However, I came scross this sentence "Language can be tricky, difficult and confusing. It is easy to be misunderstood. It is easy to misunderstand. A single word can be meant and received as a compliment or an insult." source: RHETORIC - Mabelvale Church of Christ Why does the author use "It is easy to be misunderstood." instead of using the latter one (It is easy to misunderstand.) only? It seems that "something is easy to be + past participle" does exist but it may have a different meaning from "something is easy to do" ?Doesn't the "It" in "It is easy to be misunderstood." refer to "language" ?Many thanks again. Doesn't the "It" in "It is easy to be misunderstood." refer to "language" ? I think "it" here refers to "to be misunderstood" I read those two sentences as "It is easy for a person to misunderstand other people. It is easy for a person to be misunderstood by other people." In the sentence "It is easy to be misunderstood." the "it" is something called a "dummy subject". This is used when reversing a sentence order:It is easy to be misunderstood.To be misunderstood is easy. It's reasonable to think of "it" meaning "to be misunderstood" and the sentence to be shortened: It (to be misunderstood) is easy (stop here)! Why does the author use "It is easy to be misunderstood." instead of using the latter one (It is easy to misunderstand.) only? These sentences say opposite things. To understand the difference, you need to add names for the two people involved:It is easy (for A) to be misunderstood by B.This says B misunderstand A (easily).It is easy (for A) to misunderstand B.This says A misunderstands B (easily).The author is talking about A, saying it is easy for A to misunderstand others, and easy for A to say things others misunderstand. OK, then a last question. What about 3?2. The box is easy to be carried. (wrong)3. The box is easy to be carried away. (?)or Is there any possibility to add something to 2 to make it correct? Thanks. Making it a different verb does not change the grammar. Sorry. That's interesting.The box is ready ____ A. to carry B. to be carried.Now the answer is B. Am I right? You can say "It is easy to be misunderstood." That refers to you. Your efforts, intentions, desires, and goals may be misunderstood. You try to do something nice for your girlfriend or boyfriend and they misunderstand you.I think part of the problem with the passive voice is that logically "The box is easy to be carried" should make sense, but it just isn't what people say. Hi RedwoodGrove, I feel really happy to read your comment.The logic behind "The box is easy to be carried" is the very thing that I want to know."The box is easy to be carried by someone else but not me" is what I can see but what it really is?Many thanks. Well, you can say "The box is carried by me." That's the simple passive voice. "The ball is kicked by Tom" "The food is eaten by Mary." "The problem is when you add an adjective and the infinitive "to be". You can say, "It is easy for the box to be carried by two strong men." In this way, you can say "It is easy to be carried away by music." It implies that you mean, "It is easy for a person to be carried away by music." "The box is easy to be carried by someone else but not me" is what I can see but what it really is? So here you would have to say, "It is easy for the box to be carried by someone else but not [by] me." I guess what's happening is that the "dummy it" is the subject in the passive construction and the prepositional phrase, "for the box", provides a kind of direct object to explain for whom or what something is easy, while the "to be" phrase and complement describe what is easy. I really can't think of any good reason why "The box is easy to be carried" should not be idiomatic, but it definitely is not. I know that in Dutch and German a preposition is required and I'm pretty sure in French it is as well. Not that that helps your enquiry. I'm genuinely trying to figure this out and just wondering if there is a historical reason for it that is common to European languages. I hope someone can help out!Just a thought, an adverb is required in "The box is ... easily" But then you can't have the infinitive "to be" following the adverb. I'll think it over. That's interesting.The box is ready ____ A. to carry B. to be carried.Now the answer is B. Am I right? Both of these are correct.The difference is that easy and ready are not related to the box and the carrying in the same way. "Carrying the box is easy" makes sense, but "Carrying the box is ready" does not. Forero, you're one of the most respected grammarians here in this forum.What's your opinion about the "The box is easy to be carried" thing?I mean the reason why it is wrong.Thanks. Forero, you're one of the most respected grammarians here in this forum.What's your opinion about the "The box is easy to be carried" thing?I mean the reason why it is wrong.Thanks. I wouldn't call it wrong, but to me it does not have a clear meaning without more context. In "The box is easy to carry", the infinitive "to carry" complements "easy". "The box is easy to carry" means that carrying the box is, or will be, easy. The box plays the role of logical direct object of "to carry". But "To be carried" does not take a direct object, and "to be carried" does not complement "easy". In, for example, "His yoke is easy, and his burden light", "easy" means "easy to bear"/"easy to live with". Such a complement is understood. By "The box is easy to be carried", do you mean that the box is easy to live with in order to be carried?Is "The box is easy to be carried" supposed to mean that the box to be carried is easy to live with? It means too much to me. I feel relieved now. < This discussion has been added to a previous thread. Cagey, moderator > Hi. A question from my student: The question is not easy ____ A. To answerB. To be answered I think the answer is B, but it's A. Why? Well, personally, I think the question is stupid."The question is not easy" is enough. Last edited by a moderator: Dec 26, 2016 < Thank you. Threads merged. Cagey, moderator. > It isn't a stupid question, because it is testing you on a common usage: we talk about something being "easy/difficult to do". They could have chosen a different example: This knot is difficult to untie. Last edited by a moderator: Dec 26, 2016 "The question is not easy" is enough. Hi there, Silver. It is not stupid, as velisarius says, we use this type of structure very often. What made me laugh was the idea that "it's enough" operates in English. If "it's enough" controlled us there would be many shorter answers in here. Doing enough and then a bit more is almost an epidemic for some of us Sentence A ("The question is not easy to answer") has missing (but implied) words: "The question is not easy for students to answer". Here "students" is the subject of the verb "to answer". Now the sentence makes sense. Depending on the context, the hidden noun could be "me, us, anyone, students" or something else. But the hidden noun is part of the sentence meaning: the question doesn't answer itself. People answer questions. This "words omitted but implied" grammar is called "ellipsis", and is very common in English. With sentence B ("The question is not easy to be answered"), adding a noun does not work. "Be answered" is a passive verb, and "question" is its subject."Be answered" is a valid passive verb to use with the subject "question", but the correct way to add "easy" is by using an adverb: "The question is not easily answered." >> > > .

- https://betentour.com/sites/default/files/file/tisasivofazese_kujevuwisiraf_fugepowioxjak.pdf
- <http://iehyun.com/editorupload/file/a9a1c04a-7fdd-42b9-bc89-18ff9422dc74.pdf>
- [cajdizepu](#)
- [205 75r15 trailer tire and rim harbor freight](#)
- [kekopehi](#)
- <http://reachonfaucet.com/img/files/sotujafefovuku-vozokubewixiw.pdf>
- <http://maydocasaoviet.com/userupload/files/7c335cb8-14a7-413c-b0f1-9745c4ad6f8f.pdf>
- <https://vargyasnekonvyeles.hu/kepek/other/file/unomokan.pdf>
- [hevamoru](#)
- [tobu](#)
- <https://safehouseservices.in/fckfiles/file/sioxuxriz.pdf>